

CPM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

CORPORATE OFFICE • 5111 E BROADWAY • SPOKANE VALLEY, WA 99212

P.O. BOX 3366 • SPOKANE, WA 99220-3366 • OFFICE: (509) 534-6221 • FAX: (509) 536-3051



Central Pre-Mix
Concrete Co.



Central Pre-Mix
Prestress Co.



Inland Asphalt Co.



Interstate Concrete
& Asphalt Co.



ICON Materials



Wenatchee
Sand and Gravel



Central Washington
Concrete



Eugene
Sand & Gravel



Viking Redi-Mix



Green & White
Rock Products



Klamath Pacific
Corporation

Bandon Concrete
& Development



River Bend
Sand and Gravel



Salem
Road & Driveway



Valley
Concrete & Gravel

July 20, 2015

Department of Ecology
Attn: Ms. Carrie Gaul, Water Quality Program
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, Washington 98504-7600

Subject: CPM Development Comments on Preliminary Draft Concrete Recycling Language

Dear Ms. Gaul,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Draft Concrete Recycling Language. CPM Development respectfully submits the following comments:

1. Ecology has stated that there were 28 violations, however the data provided to industry shows 26 violations from 7 permittees. Seven permittees out of 929 permits does not indicate a widespread problem - this is less than 1% of permittees. Half of the pH values are below 6.5, which makes it unlikely that recycled concrete was the problem. Additionally, it is not evidence enough to support that there is a problem with concrete recycling. The data clearly indicates that Ecology has a 99% permit compliance rate under the existing permit conditions. Furthermore, 7 of the violations occurred in 2012 from one company and have not occurred since, likely meaning there is no longer an issue.
2. The data does not reflect any violations that occurred from a storm event that produced more precipitation than a 10-year, 24-hour storm event. At least one company on that list has indicated that one of the high pH's associated with their site occurred during a storm event that was greater than the 10-year, 24-hour storm event – this is not reflected in the data provided. I would ask that Ecology re-review the data in light of 10-year, 24-hour storm events.
3. Ecology has indicated that there is no evidence of ground water impact from concrete recycling. In the July 7, 2015 presentation, Ecology listed Water Quality Concerns, but has no evidence or studies to support that. Ecology did reference a University of Wisconsin study that has yet to go through peer review or be published.
4. The proposed required Concrete Recycling BMP's actually takes the ability to recycle away from many facilities. Many facilities cannot meet the location standards listed at BMP's but are in fact already storing recycled concrete stockpiles in these areas with no issues or violations. Ecology is taking a

perceived problem from 7 permittees and is proposing to enforce strict BMP's for facilities already in compliance.

Based on the comments above and data, CPM Development Corp. does not believe that the proposed BMP's for Concrete Recycling can be supported in the permit and they should be removed. Ecology has indicated that facilities can use alternative or equally effective BMP's, however, there is no indication or evidence that any BMP's are necessary. BMP's should be used as a tool where there is a proven issue or ongoing compliance issues.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

CPM Development Corp.



Jana McDonald, PE
Environmental Engineer